DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 759 PS 005 084

AUTHOR Kitano, Harry
TITLE Measurement of Change in Social and Personal Attitudes of Parents of Children in Project Head Start.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for Head Start Evaluation and Research.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO OEO-4117
PUB DATE [69]
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes; Compensatory Education Programs; Evaluation; Individual Development; Mexican Americans; *Parent Attitudes; *Parent Participation; *Preschool Programs; Questionnaires; *Social Attitudes; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS Clark Motor Development Scale; Goodenough Draw A Man Test; Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

The project reported in this paper has 3 facets and is part of a larger one focused on finding out how to improve the prediction for scholastic success of children from disadvantaged populations. The first paper reports on a pilot study of the effect of parent participation in Head Start on subsequent utilization of community resources. It is also concerned with how parents view Head Start personnel and how individual staff members view each other. While it was demonstrated that parents did change as a result of their participation in the program, the measures used were necessarily crude. An important aspect of the project is concerned with the development and validation of an instrument which will be sensitive to these important changes. The second section reports the rationale and approach to the development of an instrument to measure pre-post changes in parental attitudes, especially in the area of alienation. The third facet is concerned with an experiment to test the value of special instruction in producing more effective modes of home teaching in parents of disadvantaged children. The first step has been the preparation of an instrument of measure parental attitudes toward the Head Start program. This instrument and the description of the study are included as the third report in this section. (Author/MK)

ED 056759

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OEO-4117

# Measurement of Change in Social and Personal Attitudes of Parents of Children in Project Head Start

Principal Investigator

Harry Kitano, Department of Social Welfare

Research Assistants

Sarah Davis
Aileen Gaal
Susan Hanson

Protocol Analysis

Alice Hughes
Frances Metter

This project has three facets. In line with the central objective of the UCLA Evaluation and Research Center, the major focus of all research is that of increasing our knowledge of how to improve the prediction for scholastic success of children from disadvantaged populations. In the past, these children have demonstrated dissonance with respect to the types of values which lead to desirable levels of achievement in the dominant culture. A basic hypothesis is that these values have their roots in parental attitudes toward the culture in general and toward education in particular. Thus the Project Head Start program places great stress on obtaining parental interest and involvement.

The first paper in this section is in the nature of a pilot study of the "Effect of parent participation in Head Start on subsequent utilization of community resources." It is also concerned with how parents view the Head Start personnel and how the individual staff members view each other.

While it was demonstrated that parents did change as a result of their participation in the program, the measures used were necessarily crude. An important aspect of the work of Project III is therefore concerned with the development and validation of an instrument which will be sensitive to

PS 005084

these important changes. The second paper reports the rationale and approach to the development of an instrument to measure pre - post changes in parental attitudes, especially in the area of alienation.

The third facet of Project III is concerned with an experiment to test "The value of special instruction in producing more effective modes of home teaching in parents of disadvantaged children." The first step has been the preparation of an instrument to measure parental attitudes toward the Head Start program. This instrument, and the description of the study are included as the third report in this section.

# Effect of parent participation in Head Start on subsequent utilization of community resources

It has often been suggested that much of the growth occurring as a result of compensatory programs is undetected by instruments which measure only changes in children's performance on I.Q. tests. The present study was an attempt to carry out an in-depth analysis of one center so as to measure the impact of an intervention program not only in terms of the changes in the children but also those occurring in the adult participants: parents, teachers, and community service personnel. In addition to the preschool program, the services offered at this center included health, social welfare, and adult education classes. This multi-disciplinary approach provided an opportunity to evaluate the effect of the interactions among the center personnel as well as the changes produced in the parents and their children.

## Method

### Subjects

There were 37 children in two classes enrolled at the center. Most of the children came from Mexican-American homes with Spanish as the first language. The personnel for each class included an experienced full-time nursery school teacher and a neighborhood aide. A part-time social worker (15 hours per week) and a nurse (20 hours per week) served both classes.

### Program

The parents of the children participated in parent education classes (three hours per week), and an English class (two hours per week). The usual medical services were provided. The children received a three-hour child-oriented

preschool curriculum on a five-day per week basis.

Pretesting took place in November, 1966, by volunteer workers. The posttesting was in June, 1967, permitting a pre-post interval of approximately six months.

Instruments Used.

a. A parent questionnaire (see Appendix A), available in a Spanish translation for those with little facility in English, was given to mothers to fill out either in the center or at home.

b. Participating professionals were requested to fill in a questionnaire (Appendix B), at the beginning and end of the program.

c. Attendance and participation records of parents at various functions were kept by the classroom teachers.

d. Records of professionals and consultants, including referrals and contacts with other community agencies, were also used as a measure of parent change in utilization of community resources.

e. All children were given the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the Clark Motor Test at the beginning and end of the period. The Goodenough Draw-a-Man Test was given only as a posttest.

f. Case reports and teacher summaries were used to help evaluate changes in individual children.

Results

Table 1 presents pre- and posttest means for chronological age and for

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

three measures of performance. Unfortunately, the Goodenough Draw-a-Man Test,

which is least likely to reflect language acquisition, was given only as a posttest. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test shows a significant change ($p < .05$) from pre- to posttest. However, the pretesting was done by non-professional personnel, and it is very possible that some ad hoc translating into Spanish was done. In spite of this, eight of the 26 children were unable to respond appropriately to even one item. On the posttest, two of these children still could not respond to the English words. However, four of the eight scored at the two-year-old level, one scored at three, and one at four.

The Clark Motor Development Scale is a new instrument intended to help teachers evaluate the motor development of the young child. It is not a standardized test and the values given in Table 1 indicate the raw scores, based on a total possible of 40 points. The scores are not to be looked at as norms, but simply as a measure of change. Evidently the performance of these children showed no reliable differences after the six month preschool experience in those skills measured by this test. Some of the subtests consisted of balancing on one foot, hopping on one foot, galloping, skipping, catching a bean bag, and touching fingers independently.

The results of the questionnaires given to parents and professionals at the center are reported in Tables 2 and 3. The reports of both professionals

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Tables 2 & 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

and parents showed change in a positive direction. That is, either their perception of the role of the profession became clearer, or their appreciation of the persons contribution to either the parent or the child was improved.

PS 005084

There seemed to be a slight, though not statistically reliable, tendency for decreases in the perception of the roles of doctor and social worker on the part of the parents. Professional perception of the role of the nurse also showed a decrease, but again these differences were so small as to be attributable to chance.

Discussion

Using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test simply as a measure of language rather than of mental ability, it is quickly apparent that these children are still considerably below the level of middle-class children of the same age and will be at a severe disadvantage when entering the average American school. While this language deficit is to be expected with children where English is not spoken in the home, the scores on the Goodenough Draw-a-Man Test, which taps certain basic intellectual abilities independent of language, are also below the norm. Thus, in spite of the fact that very considerable gains were made during the intervention period, it is clear that these children need a continued enrichment program throughout the primary grades.

In addition to the measured gains in language, the anecdotal records of the teachers reported improvement in other significant areas of behavior. The beginning of independence from the parent, with the concomitant development of the ability to work well with others, children as well as adults, were very important gains. Also, the children became adapted to the routines of the school environment and familiar with the appropriate use of materials and equipment and familiar with the appropriate use of materials and equipment. Not only will these changes help the child make the transition into kindergarten; he will also be better able to profit from programs planned to build on and extend the gains made in the preschool year.

Analysis of the data from the interviews shows definite growth in a positive direction. Initial misunderstandings, initial misperceptions of roles, e.g. questions such as: "What does a nurse really do?", "What is a social worker?", "Who makes what decisions under what circumstances?", led to the development of better working relationships among the members of the professional teams. However, the most effective professional interactions were among those members who worked together on one site. Further, those professionals who had most contact with parents and children showed the most growth.

In addition to the data reported in tabular form, anecdotal records and other personal reports and conferences suggest that "outside consultants" are viewed as outsiders, and therefore remain relatively isolated from the on-going concerns of those professionals actively involved in the day-to-day operations.

Among the parents, the degree of involvement, participation, and perceptions of the program showed wide variations. There seemed to be a bimodal distribution, with one group responding extremely favorably, participating enthusiastically, reporting on the helpfulness of the program to themselves and to their children, while the response of a second group was characterized by a degree of apathy, spasmodic attendance, and a low degree of overall involvement. These results may reflect the fact that only a little over half of the questionnaires were returned, introducing an important population bias. It may be that only parents feeling strongly, either in a positive or negative direction, filled out the forms, while those who were indifferent or held moderate views failed to reply.

One important outcome of the program at this Child Development Center was the creation of a strong rapport and neighborhood feeling among the parents who participated. The need to obtain full parent involvement is an oft noted concern of all professionals working in the Head Start program. The present study demonstrated that conscious effort to clarify professional roles is of value not only to the parents but also to the professional workers themselves. It was also demonstrated that while children's gains are considerable, they are not sufficient to overcome four years of educational and language deficits. Cessation of an enrichment program at the point where these children enter the regular school system will in effect be slamming the door just as we have glimpsed what is possible.

Table 1

C.A. and M.A. (in months) on Peabody Picture Vocabulary, Goodenough Draw-a-Man, and Clark Motor Development Tests

| Measure | N | November 1966 | | N | June 1967 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | S.D. | | Mean | S.D. |
| Chronological Age | 33 | 62.4 | 4.3 | 33 | 69.4 | 4.0 |
| Peabody | 26 | 31.8 | 24.0 | 25 | 44.0 | 14.2 |
| Clark | 23 | 29.2 | 7.2 | 23 | 24.5 | 7.0 |
| Goodenough | (Not Given) | | | 29 | 55.4 | 13.4 |

Table 2

Ratings of Perceptions by Professionals & Parents with Reference to:

| Professional Category | Professional Roles of Others | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Responses[1] by Professionals (N = 6) | | | | | | Responses by Parents (N = 24) | | | | | |
| | Pre | | | Post | | | Pre | | | Post | | |
| | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Supervisor | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | 7 | 4 | | 3 |
| Teacher | 2 | 4 | | 4 | 2 | | 6 | | 2 | 7 | | |
| Nurse | 3 | 2 | | 2 | 3 | | 8 | | | 7 | | |
| Doctor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 5 | | 3 | | 7 | |
| Social Worker | 1 | 4 | | 3 | 2 | | 5 | | 3 | 6 | | |
| Volunteer | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 6 | | 2 | 7 | | |

| Professional Category | Helpfulness of Professionals to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Parents | | | | | | | | | | | | Children | | | | | |
| | Responses by Professionals | | | | | | Responses by Parents | | | | | | Responses by Parents | | | | | |
| | Pre | | | Post | | | Pre | | | Post | | | Pre | | | Post | | |
| | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Supervisor | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | 4 | | | 1 | 1 | | 3 | | |
| Teacher | 1 | 5 | | 4 | 2 | | 5 | 4 | | 5 | 2 | | 8 | 1 | | 6 | 1 | |
| Nurse | 2 | 3 | | 4 | 1 | | 4 | 4 | | 5 | 2 | | 5 | 1 | | 6 | 1 | |
| Doctor | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | | 2 | 3 | | 4 | 2 | |
| Social Worker | 1 | 4 | | 4 | 1 | | 3 | 2 | | 2 | 3 | | 2 | 3 | | 3 | 1 | |
| Volunteer | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | | 1 | 4 | | 2 | 2 | | 3 | 3 | | 6 | | |

Note.--- For all responses: 3 = high level; 2 = moderate; 1 = little

Table 3

Average Level of Perception by Professionals & Parents with Reference to:

| Professional Category | a. Professional Roles of Staff | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Responses by Professionals | | Responses by Parents | |
| | Pre | Post | Pre | Post |
| Supervisor | 2.3 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 2.1 |
| Teacher | 2.3 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 3.0 |
| Nurse | 2.6 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Doctor | 1.7 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Social Worker | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 3.0 |
| Volunteer | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 3.0 |

| Professional Category | Helpfulness of Professionals to: | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | b. Parents | | | | c. Children | |
| | Responses by Professionals | | Responses by Parents | | Responses by Parents | |
| | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post |
| Supervisor | 2.0 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 3.0 |
| Teacher | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Nurse | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| Doctor | 1.5 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.7 |
| Social Worker | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Volunteer | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 |

Measurement of changes in parental feelings of alienation as a result of participation in Head Start

Probably one of the most distinctive features of Project Head Start is its emphasis on dealing with the total child. While the professed objective is to bring children from educationally disadvantaged homes to a level of performance more closely approximating that of children from middle-class environments, the program recognizes that the development of academic skills is inextricably related not only to the child's health and nutrition, but in large measure to those affective influences brought to bear upon him in his own home. Thus, parents who feel estranged and hopeless about their own roles in our society are apt to transmit to their children the feeling that effort expended in school learning has little value.

For this reason, a conscious attempt is made to involve the parent of the Head Start child as a volunteer in the classroom, and to make her aware of the various types of community services available to her. Parent education classes are usually part of the regular Head Start program and, in cases where many of the parents do not speak English, language classes are often organized. There seems to be good reason to believe that such efforts will produce changes in those feelings of alienation and powerlessness which characterize the disadvantaged. However, subjective impressions are not acceptable scientific evidence, and there is need for an instrument to dependably measure affective changes which come about as the result of participation in the Head Start program.

The purpose of the present study is to develop an instrument to measure the effect of various parent-centered programs on the feelings of these parents in relation to the community and society at large, with specific reference to a sense of alienation. It is expected that attitudes toward the Head Start program in general, the individual school or class in particular, and also, possibly, to the intrafamilial relationships, will demonstrate change, hopefully in a positive direction.

Review of the Literature

The area of social integration and concomitant social alienation has been the concern of many social scientists since the concept was first put forth in the late 1800's (Durkheim 1956). Many aspects of the problem have been investigated, including the relation of anomie to social class, frequency of suicide, and political participation. It is generally agreed that alienation is related to education, income, and occupation.

The initial work in this area, done by Leo Srole (1956), delineated five major components of anomia: 1) the individual's sense that community leaders are detached from or indifferent to his needs, reflecting a severance of the interdependent bond within the social system between leaders and those they should represent and serve; 2) the individual's perception of social order as essentially fickle and unpredictable, inducing the sense that under such conditions he can do little to accomplish his life goals; 3) the individual's view that not only must he lower his future life goals, but that he and people like him are losing ground in the goals they have already achieved; 4) the deflation or loss of internalized social norms and values reflected in the individual's sense of the meaninglessness of life itself; and 5) the individual's perception that his framework of immediate personal relations can no longer

be maintained.

These five areas form the base not only for Srole's five-item scale but also for much of the subsequent work in this area, both in terms of the construction of various measures and also from a theoretical standpoint. Srole's initial study involved the use of an abbreviated "F" scale along with his Anomia scale and another instrument designed to study attitudes toward minorities. The results seem to indicate that there is "support for the general hypothesis of an interactive process linking the individual state of anomia and interpersonal dysfunction in the social realm" (P. 711). Srole goes on to discuss the functional relationship of different types of personality within the setting of a democratic society. Paraphrasing Merton and Fromm, Srole concludes that "social dysfunction is the dependent variable, the individual's state of self-to-group alienation is the intervening variable, and change in personality (Fromm) or adaptive modes (Merton) is the dependent variable" (P. 716). This is related to Nettler's comment that the alienated are "ideological displaced persons" (Nettler, P. 674) and the observation of Maslow (cited by Nettler, p. 675) that some degree of alienation is necessary in our society for a healthy and fully functioning personality.

Following this same line of investigation, Dean (1961) has shown that alienation has a low negative correlation with occupational prestige, education, income, and background. He concludes that "Alienation is not a personality 'trait' but a situation-relevant variable" (P. 757). Dean has also pointed out that other researchers have found the dimension of normlessness to be related to religious orthodoxy among Protestants. However, when socioeconomic status is held constant, this relationship disappears. Nettler (1957) draws the distinction between alienation as a psychological state of the individual and anomie,

which he feels is a societal state of normlessness. This distinction is a useful one and one which many other authors also make. Many studies thus agree that the dimension of alienation or anomie is negatively related to education and some measure of social class (Powell, 1958; Warshay, 1964, and Dean, 1961). Meier and Bell (1959) conclude that there is a "very high negative correlation between anomia, as measured by the Srole scale, and structural access to the means for the achievement of life goals " (P. 190).

A variety of measures have been devised and used to delineate alienation with reference to various social phenomena. Generally speaking, there has been agreement in the words used to define this concept. Elmore (1963) uses such terms as meaninglessness, hopelessness, powerlessness, valuelessness, aloneness, and closedmindedness, while Seeman (1959) refers to normlessness and self-estrangement. In the present investigation, the objective is to design a scale which will not only measure component elements in the concept of alienation, but will also be sensitive to changes which may be produced by planned social interventions within the Head Start framework.

## Method

### Subjects

The scale described below was administered to 56 Head Start parents, 97 graduate students in the Department of Social Welfare, and 19 Head Start personnel.

### Procedure

A set of 198 items were selected from ten scales, as follows:

Berger (1952) Scale of Acceptance of Others. (31 items)

California Personality Inventory (34 items)

Comrey (in Dahlstrom and Welsh, 1960, p. 412) Cynicism Factor (7 items)

Dean (1961) Composite Scales of Alienation (24 items)

Elmore Composite Scales of Alienation (69 items)

MMPI Persecution Scale in Dahlstrom and Welsh, 1960 (3 items)

Nettler (1957) Scale of Societal Estrangement (17 items)

Srole (1956) Fascism Scale abbreviated (3 items)

Srole (1956) Scale of Anomia (5 items)

Zimmer (in McDill and Ridley, 1962) Scale of Political Alienation (5 items)

In addition to the items drawn from these scales, 18 new items were constructed to measure child-rearing attitudes in general as well as attitudes toward the effects of the Head Start program. The total scale thus consisted of 213 items. (See Table 1 for item descriptions and scale sources.)

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

All subjects were instructed that their responses would be kept anonymous, and were completely voluntary. They were asked to answer each item as honestly as possible using a true/false response. Due to the fact that this was a pilot study with a large pool of items, the subjects were to ask questions freely as well as to make comments which might help reword ambiguous statements.

The 216 item scale was administered for the most part in group settings at the various sites and by mail to the UCLA students. A Spanish translation made it possible to include a number of Spanish speaking parents.

## Results

The characteristics of the three sample populations are presented in Table 2. The age categories are in eight groupings, with the first group not

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

listed since there were no subjects under 20 years of age. The average age for all the groups would thus fall at the top of the third category, i.e. between 28 and 29 years.

The responses of the 170 subjects to each of the 216 items in the scale were scored in terms of the 21 subscales (see Table 1) plus a total score over all the items, providing 22 scores per respondent. A factor analysis of the data yielded 10 distinct primary factor loadings (See Table 3). Of the

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

items, 103 were found to discriminate among the three populations at the .001 level of significance, with 43 more items discriminating at the .05 level. Further analyses of the data are in progress, to provide a basis for reducing the number of items in the scale. It will also be necessary to hold the socio-economic status factor constant so as to discriminate high and low alienation groups within a particular subculture.

## Discussion

After the projected analyses, a variable measure of alienation should be available for use as a pre-and posttest measure to evaluate changes in feelings of alienation which can be effected through Head Start intervention. A study is now getting underway which involves providing parents with materials and techniques for improving the language performance of their Head Start children. Hopefully the scale reported in this study will provide insight into what types

of changes can be expected when parents are given tangible evidence that they are not completely powerless and that there are some areas in which they can make real contributions to the future prospects of their children.

## References

Bell, W. Anomie, social isolation and the class structure. Sociometry, 1957, 20, 105-116.

Berger, E. M. The relation between the expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 778-782.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.

Dahlstrom, W. G., & Welsh, G. S. A Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory handbook. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Dean, D. G. Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 753-758.

Durkheim, E. Education and sociology. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1956.

Elmore, T. M. The development of a scale to measure psychological anomie. Dissertation Abstracts, 1963, 23, 3006.

Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1943.

Meier, D., & Bell, W. Anomia and differential access to the achievement of life goals. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 189-202.

McDill, E. L., & Ridley, J. C. Status, anomia, political alienation and political participation. American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 68, 205-213.

Nettler, G. A measure of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 670-678.

Powell, E. H. Occupation, status and suicide: A redefinition of anomie. American Sociological Review, 1958, 23, 131-139.

Seeman, M. The meaning of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 783-79.

Strole, L. Social integration and certain corollaries: An exploratory study. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 709-716.

Warshay, L., Goldman, M., & Biddle, E. Anomie and F Scales as related to social characteristics. Journal of Social Psychology, 1964, 62, 117-123.

Table 1

Description of Population Tested

| | | Total | | Parents | | Students | | Headstart Personnel (Professional & Semi-Pro) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Male | | 35 | 20.6 | 2 | 3.6 | 33 | 34.7 | | |
| Female | | 135 | 79.4 | 54 | 96.4 | 62 | 65.3 | 19 | 100.0 |
| Age | Group | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 2 | 28 | 18.7 | 4 | 7.3 | 20 | 26.3 | 4 | 21.1 |
| 25-29 | 3 | 51 | 34.0 | 24 | 43.6 | 22 | 29.0 | 5 | 26.3 |
| 30-34 | 4 | 24 | 16.0 | 10 | 18.2 | 12 | 15.8 | 2 | 10.5 |
| 35-39 | 5 | 24 | 16.0 | 13 | 23.6 | 8 | 10.5 | 3 | 15.8 |
| 40-44 | 6 | 11 | 7.3 | 1 | 1.8 | 7 | 9.2 | 3 | 15.8 |
| 45-49 | 7 | 10 | 6.7 | 3 | 5.5 | 7 | 9.2 | | |
| 50+ | 8 | 2 | 1.3 | | | | | 2 | 10.5 |
| Mean Age Grouping | | 3.8 | | 3.9 | | 3.8 | | 4.2 | |
| S.D. | | 1.5 | | 1.2 | | 1.6 | | 1.9 | |
| Marital Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Married | | 89 | 52.1 | 24 | 42.9 | 55 | 57.3 | 10 | 52.6 |
| Divorced | | 25 | 14.6 | 13 | 23.2 | 8 | 8.3 | 4 | 21.1 |
| Separated | | 13 | 7.6 | 12 | 21.4 | | | 1 | 5.3 |
| Widowed | | 4 | 2.3 | 3 | 5.4 | | | 1 | 5.3 |
| Single | | 40 | 23.4 | 4 | 7.1 | 33 | 34.4 | 3 | 15.8 |

Table 1 (con't)

| | Total | | Parents | | Students | | Headstart Personnel (Professional & Semi-Pro) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Race | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Negro | 29 | 17.1 | 17 | 30.4 | 5 | 5.3 | 7 | 36.8 |
| Caucasian | 112 | 65.9 | 19 | 33.9 | 86 | 90.5 | 7 | 36.8 |
| Mex./Amer. | 14 | 8.2 | 7 | 12.5 | 2 | 2.1 | 5 | 26.3 |
| Latin/Amer. | 8 | 4.7 | 8 | 14.3 | | | | |
| Mexican | 5 | 2.9 | 5 | 8.9 | | | | |
| Oriental | 2 | 1.2 | | | 2 | 2.1 | | |
| Language Needs | | | | | | | | |
| English | 154 | 89.5 | 40 | 71.4 | 97 | 100.0 | 17 | 89.5 |
| Spanish | 18 | 10.5 | 16 | 28.6 | | | 2 | 10.5 |

Table 2

Item Description, Scale Sources, and Scores

For Parents, University Students, and Head Start Personnel

| | Item # | Total | Parents | Students | Pro + Semi-Pro |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale 1:0-3 MMPI--Persecution | | | | | |
| Range | 1-3 | 0-3 | 0-3 | 1-3 | 0-3 |
| Mean | | 1.70 | 1.27 | 1.96 | 1.68 |
| S.D. | | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.52 | 0.67 |
| Scale 2:0-5 Srole--Abbreviated Fascism Scale | | | | | |
| Range | 4-6 | 0-3 | 0-3 | 0-2 | 0-3 |
| Mean | | 0.86 | 2.02 | 0.13 | 1.16 |
| S.D. | | 1.15 | 1.09 | 0.40 | 1.01 |
| Scale 3:0-7 Comrey--Cynicism Factor | | | | | |
| Range | 7-13 | 0-7 | 0-7 | 1-7 | 0-7 |
| Mean | | 4.22 | 2.86 | 5.07 | 3.84 |
| S.D. | | 2.19 | 2.24 | 1.75 | 2.03 |
| Scale 4:0-5 Srole--Anomia Scale | | | | | |
| Range | 14-18 | 0-5 | 0-5 | 0-5 | 0-5 |
| Mean | | 1.62 | 2.77 | 0.84 | 2.26 |
| S.D. | | 1.57 | 1.49 | 1.04 | 1.73 |
| Scale 5:0-5 Zimmer--Political Alienation | | | | | |
| Range | 19-23 | 0-5 | 0-5 | 0-5 | 1-5 |
| Mean | | 2.84 | 3.05 | 2.72 | 2.79 |
| S.D. | | 1.34 | 1.31 | 1.35 | 1.36 |
| Scale 6:0-5 UCLA--Aspirations for Child | | | | | |
| Range | 24-28 | 0-4 | 0-3 | 0-4 | 0-3 |
| Mean | | 1.58 | 1.93 | 1.37 | 1.58 |
| S.D. | | 0.94 | 0.85 | 0.95 | 0.90 |

Table 2 (con't)

| | Item # | Total | Parents | Students | Pro + Semi-Pro |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale 7:0-17 Nettler Scale of Social Estrangement | | | | | |
| Range | 29-45 | 0-13 | 1-11 | 1-13 | 0-11 |
| Mean | | 6.65 | 5.29 | 7.65 | 5.53 |
| S.D. | | 2.82 | 2.36 | 2.45 | 3.79 |
| Scale 8:0-9 Dean Subscale 1 Powerlessness | | | | | |
| Range | | 0-9 | 1-9 | 0-9 | 1-9 |
| Mean | | 4.20 | 5.10 | 3.28 | 4.47 |
| S.D. | | 2.24 | 1.95 | 1.86 | 2.46 |
| Scale 9:0-6 Dean Subscale 2 Normlessness | | | | | |
| Range | | 0-6 | 0-6 | 0-6 | 0-6 |
| Mean | | 2.41 | 3.48 | 1.68 | 2.95 |
| S.D. | | 1.82 | 1.84 | 1.41 | 1.96 |
| Scale 10:0-9 Dean Subscale 3 Social Isolation | | | | | |
| Range | | 0-8 | 0-8 | 0-8 | 0-7 |
| Mean | | 3.88 | 4.32 | 3.59 | 4.05 |
| S.D. | | 1.79 | 1.81 | 1.74 | 1.81 |
| Scale 11:0-24 Dean Alienation Scale | | | | | |
| Range | 46-69 | 0-22 | 2-22 | 0-19 | 3-22 |
| Mean | | 10.48 | 13.5 | 8.55 | 11.47 |
| S.D. | | 4.95 | 4.64 | 4.05 | 5.48 |
| Scale 12:0-31 Berger Scale of Acceptance of Others | | | | | |
| Range | 70-97 | 1-23 | 3-23 | 1-18 | 2-19 |
| Mean | 208, 209, 211 | 7.67 | 11.18 | 5.55 | 7.79 |
| S.D. | | 4.81 | 5.21 | 3.14 | 4.59 |

Table 2 (con't)

| | Item # | Total | Parents | Students | Pro + Semi-Pro |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale 13:0-34 California Personality Inventory S-a (self-acceptance) | | | | | |
| Range | 98-131 | 6-23 | 9-23 | 6-21 | 9-21 |
| Mean | | 13.77 | 15.21 | 13.0 | 13.47 |
| S.D. | | 3.42 | 3.24 | 3.18 | 3.91 |
| Scale 14:-2 to 15 Elmore[1] General Factor--Meaninglessness | | | | | |
| Range | | 0-15 | 0-14 | 0-10 | 0-15 |
| Mean | | 4.23 | 6.75 | 2.58 | 5.26 |
| S.D. | | 3.62 | 3.93 | 1.77 | 4.98 |
| Scale 15:-4 to 17 Elmore 1st Factor--Valuelessness | | | | | |
| Range | | -3 to 15 | -3-+14 | -3-+9 | -1-+15 |
| Mean | | 3.29 | 4.61 | 2.21 | 4.95 |
| S.D. | | 3.68 | 4.36 | 2.40 | 4.99 |
| Scale 16:-7 to 17 Elmore 2nd Factor--Hopelessness | | | | | |
| Range | | -7 to +12 | -5-+12 | -7-+9 | -5-+12 |
| Mean | | 0.89 | 4.46 | -1.40 | 2.05 |
| S.D. | | 4.75 | 4.79 | 3.07 | 4.97 |
| Scale 17:-6 to 16 Elmore 3rd Factor--Powerlessness | | | | | |
| Range | | -6 to +13 | -5-+13 | -6-+6 | -5-+13 |
| Mean | | 0.48 | 4.21 | -1.98 | 2.05 |
| S.D. | | 4.89 | 4.99 | 2.79 | 5.55 |
| Scale 18:-6 to 15 Elmore 4th Factor--Aloneness | | | | | |
| Range | | -6 to +14 | -6-+14 | -5-+7 | -4-+11 |
| Mean | | 1.38 | 3.50 | -0.05 | 2.42 |
| S.D. | | 3.86 | 4.53 | 2.43 | 4.55 |

[1]Items taken from the Elmore Scale are Nos. 132-199 and 210 in the UCLA Scale.

Table 2 (con't)

| | Item # | Total | Parents | Students | Pro + Semi-Pro |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scale 19:-5 to 14 | Elmore 5th Factor--Closemindedness | | | | |
| Range | | -5 to +13 | -5-+13 | -5-+9 | -3-+11 |
| Mean | | 2.12 | 4.55 | 0.48 | 3.26 |
| S.D. | | 3.88 | 4.17 | 2.72 | 3.98 |
| Scale 20:0 to 5 | UCLA Community and Self Scale | | | | |
| Range | 201-205 | 0-5 | 0-4 | 0-4 | 0-5 |
| Mean | | 1.57 | 0.98 | 1.89 | 1.68 |
| S.D. | | 1.10 | 0.73 | 1.14 | 1.20 |
| Scale 21:0 to 8 | UCLA Child-Rearing Scale | | | | |
| Range | 200, 206, 207 | 0-7 | 0-5 | 0-7 | 0-3 |
| Mean | 212-216 | 2.02 | 2.57 | 1.68 | 2.16 |
| S.D. | | 1.38 | 1.52 | 1.27 | 0.83 |
| Scale 22:-25 to 216 | All Scales | | | | |
| Range | 216 | 14-173 | 28-171 | 14-127 | 35-173 |
| Mean | | 77.81 | 104.21 | 60.78 | 86.89 |
| S.D. | | 37.53 | 39.54 | 22.85 | 44.70 |

Table 3

Factor Loadings with $\chi^2$ 3-Way Levels of Significance Among 3 Populations

Factor 1: Disappointment in Human Nature and in the Nature of Society

| Item # | Significance Level | Scale Sources | Other Factor Loadings | Factor 1 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | .001 | 2 | | +.515 |
| 12 | .001 | 3 | | +.477 |
| 17 | .001 | 4 | | +.475 |
| 20 | .001 | 5 | | +.473 |
| 49 | .001 | 9 | | +.397 |
| 53 | .001 | 10 | | -.408 |
| 75 | .001 | 12 | | +.274 |
| 87 | .001 | 12 | | +.386 |
| 135 | .001 | 17 | | +.558 |
| 137 | .001 | 15 | | +.470 |
| 190 | .001 | 17 & 18 | | +.434 |
| 191 | .001 | 16 | | +.255 |
| 192 | .001 | 14 | | +.530 |
| 9 | .001 | 3 | 8 | +.368 |
| 13 | .001 | 3 | 4 | +.468 |
| 14 | .001 | 4 | 8 | +.361 |
| 44 | .05 | 7 | 6 | +.360 |
| 45 | .001 | 7 | 7 | +.345 |
| 51 | .005 | 8 | 6 | +.312 |
| 62 | .001 | 10 | 8 | +.335 |
| 66 | .001 | 8 | 5 | +.412 |
| 88 | .001 | 12 | 3 | +.272 |

Note.— See Table 2 for Item Description and Scale Sources.

Table 3 (con't)

| Item # | Significance Level | Scale Sources | Other Factor Loadings | Factor 1 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 89 | .001 | 12 | 9 | +.375 |
| 94 | .001 | 12 | 8 | +.342 |
| 136 | .001 | 14-16-17 & 18 | 8 | +.402 |
| 150 | .001 | 19 | 2 | +.425 |
| 167 | .005 | 18 | 10 | -.428 |
| 172 | .05 | 15 | 9 | -.444 |
| 189 | .001 | 14 | 9 | +.431 |

| Factor 2: Disillusionment--Valuelessness and Hopelessness | | | | Factor 2 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 142 | | 15 | | +.327 |
| 148 | .005 | 16 | | +.580 |
| 149 | | 15 | | +.646 |
| 156 | .001 | 15 & 16 | | +.341 |
| 161 | .05 | 15 | | +.498 |
| 164 | | 18 | | +.544 |
| 165 | | 19 | | +.408 |
| 185 | .001 | 17 | | +.499 |
| 23 | .05 | 5 | 7 | -.355 |
| 68 | | 8 | 9 | -.374 |
| 134 | .001 | 15 | 1 | +.382 |
| 158 | .001 | 15 | 1 | +.415 |
| 162 | | 14-17 & 18 | 5 | +.322 |
| 56 | | 10 | | +.215 |

Table 3 (con't)

Factor 3: Acceptance of Self and Others

| Item # | Significance Level | Scale Sources | Other Factor Loadings | Factor 3 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 86 | | 12 | | +.512 |
| 105 | | 13 | | -.418 |
| 29 | .001 | 7 | 1 | -.377 |
| 55 | | 9 | 9 | +.282 |
| 81 | | 12 | 1 | -.243 |
| 83 | .005 | 12 | 8 | +.429 |
| 110 | .05 | 13 | 8 | -.445 |
| 124 | .005 | 13 | 1 | +.278 |
| 182 | | 14 & 15 | 2 | +.340 |

Factor 4: Child Rearing Patterns

| Variable | | | Factor 4 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|
| 200 | .05 | 21 | -.489 |
| 204 | .001 | 20 | -.646 |
| 207 | .001 | 21 | -.573 |
| 208 | .005 | 12 | -.392 |
| 210 | .001 | 15 | -.697 |
| 211 | .001 | 12 | -.607 |
| 213 | | 21 | -.510 |
| 214 | .001 | 21 | -.639 |
| 215 | .001 | 21 | -.689 |
| 216 | .001 | 21 | -.514 |
| 95 | .001 | 12 | -.227 |

Table 3 (con't)

| Variable | Significance Level | Scale Sources | Other Factor Loadings | Factor 4 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 202 | .001 | 20 | 2 | -.393 |
| 203 | .005 | 20 | 3 | -.646 |

Factor 5: Aspirations for Child and View of Self

| | | | | Factor 5 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | .001 | 2 | | +.392 |
| 28 | | 6 | | +.372 |
| 79 | .001 | 12 | | +.351 |
| 91 | .05 | 12 | | +.438 |
| 192 | .001 | 14 | | -.204 |
| 1 | | 1 | 2 | -.322 |
| 26 | .005 | 6 | 4 | +.278 |
| 34 | | 7 | 3 | +.291 |
| 36 | .05 | 7 | 8 | +.168 |
| 71 | .005 | 12 | 9 | +.334 |
| 97 | .001 | 12 | 7 | +.329 |
| 100 | | 13 | 1 | +.397 |

Factor 6: Relation of Self to Others

| Item # | | | Factor 6 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|
| 103 | .01 | 13 | +.351 |
| 107 | | 13 | +.317 |
| 118 | .05 | 13 | +.319 |
| 131 | | 13 | +.241 |

Table 3 (con't)

| Item # | Significance Level | Scale Sources | Other Factor Loadings | Factor 6 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24 | | 6 | 9 | +.096 |
| 38 | | 7 | 5 | +.405 |
| 46 | | 10 | 8 | +.426 |
| 74 | .001 | 12 | 1 | +.288 |
| 78 | | 12 | 7 | +.339 |
| 108 | | 13 | 2 | +.289 |
| 114 | | 13 | 8 | +.367 |
| 119 | | 13 | 9 | +.333 |
| 127 | .001 | 13 | 1 | +.426 |
| 138 | | 19 | 1 | +.550 |
| 147 | .05 | 19 | 9 | +.282 |
| 168 | | 16 - 17 & 19 | 9 | +.389 |

| Factor 7: Role of Self In Community | | | | Factor 7 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | .001 | 7 | | +.522 |
| 37 | .001 | 7 | | +.319 |
| 2 | .001 | 1 | 1 | +.414 |
| 22 | | 5 | 4 | -.281 |
| 30 | .001 | 7 | 1 | +.371 |
| 31 | .001 | 7 | 6 | +.315 |
| 42 | .001 | 7 | 2 | +.382 |
| 82 | .001 | 12 | 5 | +.398 |
| 84 | .005 | 12 | 2 | +.374 |
| 129 | .001 | 13 | 3 | +.402 |
| 188 | | 15 | 1 | -.369 |

Table 3 (con't)

Factor 8: Acceptance of Others

| Variable | Significance Level | Scale Sources | Other Factor Loadings | Factor 8 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 102 | | 13 | | -.710 |
| 109 | .001 | 13 | | -.647 |
| 123 | .001 | 13 | | -.712 |
| 128 | | 13 | | -.578 |
| 39 | | 7 | 6 | -.236 |
| 62 | .001 | 10 | 1 | -.337 |
| 64 | .001 | 9 | 9 | -.292 |
| 70 | | 12 | | +.382 |
| 111 | .001 | 13 | 6 | -.490 |
| 112 | .001 | 13 | 5 | +.299 |
| 115 | | 13 | 10 | -.430 |
| 125 | | 13 | 5 | -.246 |
| 198 | | 17 | 2 | +.372 |
| 199 | .001 | 16 | 1 | -.277 |

Factor 9: Powerlessness, Close Mindedness, Aloneness

| | | | | Factor 9 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 173 | .001 | 17 | | +.502 |
| 176 | .001 | 19 | | +.502 |
| 177 | .001 | 14 - 15 & 17 | | +.674 |
| 25 | .001 | 6 | 7 | +.292 |
| 43 | .005 | 7 | 5 | +.339 |
| 47 | .001 | 8 | 2 | +.271 |
| 152 | .001 | 17 | 8 | +.430 |

Table 3 (con't)

| Variable | Significance Level | Scale Sources | Other Factor Loadings | Factor 9 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 170 | .001 | 14 - 15 & 17 | 5 | +.535 |
| 179 | | 18 | 2 | +.279 |
| 181 | .001 | 16 & 18 | 3 | +.434 |
| 183 | .001 | 15 | 1 | +.482 |
| 187 | | 19 | 2 | +.314 |

Factor 10: Social Estrangement

| | | | | Factor 10 Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 99 | | 13 | | -.491 |
| 58 | | 8 | | -.272 |
| 8 | | 3 | 1 | +.274 |
| 27 | | 6 | 9 | +.281 |
| 80 | .05 | 12 | 9 | -.265 |
| 101 | | 13 | 8 | -.378 |
| 117 | .05 | 13 | 1 | -.365 |
| 139 | .001 | 18 | 2 | -.262 |
| 155 | | 17 | 6 | -.499 |
| 201 | .05 | 20 | 4 | -.327 |

The value of special instruction in producing more effective modes of home teaching in parents of disadvantaged children

In the middle-class home, parents are not only concerned with the physical well-being and nurturance of their children, but also with their early cognitive growth and development. Thus the middle-class parent takes on the role of teacher and provides many learning opportunities, even while the child is still in the infant stage. The child's first fumbling attempts at walking and talking are eagerly attended and warmly reinforced. There is a great deal of verbal interaction; childish questions are responded to with serious consideration, and the child soon learns that seeking information is doubly rewarding: he gains greater control over his environment and also receives a large measure of parental approbation.

The child from the socioeconomically-disadvantaged home does not usually see his parents as teachers. In most cases, the verbal interaction is extremely limited, extending primarily to demands, rebukes, and expletives. There is every reason to believe that this is a major factor in perpetuating the cycle of school failure in the poverty population. Parents who are limited in their own use of language and who are unaware of its value as an intellectual tool, are poorly qualified to provide the type of stimulation the preschool child needs.

For the pilot experiment, eight parent-child pairs, randomly selected from each of two Head Start centers are being taught a technique for expanding the child's use of language. Through specially-prepared picture books, consisting of a sequence of paired pictures, two independent but parallel stories are presented. Thus pictures one and two are of a boy and a girl; the commentary reads: "This is Tom; this is Betty." The next set of pictures are: "Tom is a little boy; Betty is a little girl." The

story continues in parallel fashion through about 20 paired sets of pictures. The first time through the book, the adult reads the commentary for both pictures. The second time, the adult says: "I'll tell you the story of Betty and you tell me the story of Tom." Finally, the child on the third trial tells both parts of the story.

The treatment for the test experiment consists of having the Head Start classroom teacher present the books, and instructions on how to use them at home, to groups of three or four parents in the school setting. The parents come to the school one day a week for four weeks and are given a different story book each time.

Criterion tests, given as both pre-and-post measures, will consist of the Parent Interview, to measure changes in parents, and a parallel-production test to measure changes in children's ability to produce well-formed sentences. If the results of this study show positive effects on either the parents or the children, a longer training program will be given, with a new Head Start population entering in the Winter semester. At this time, a treatment which will involve a program for teaching each parent directly will be compared with the one in which the Head Start teacher also teaches the parents of the children.

The instrument to measure alienation will be used in addition to the parent interview for the parents, and standard measures of verbal ability as well as tests over content and reading skills will be given to the children.

Parent Interview

A Measure of Parental Attitudes to Detect Change as a Function of Participation in the Head Start Program

1. When you first heard about the Head Start program, what did you expect it would do for your child and how did you think he'd respond to it?

2. Do you feel that Head Start has done what you expected it to do?

3. Why do you feel that this happened?

4. What would you like to see this program do for your child?

5. When you first heard about the Head Start program, what were some of your worries and concerns about this?

6. When you first heard about Head Start, what did you expect it would do for you?

7. Do you feel that Head Start has done what you expected it to do <u>for you</u>?

8. Why do you feel that this happened?

9. What would you like to see this program do <u>for you</u>?

10. What did you expect the teachers would be like?

11. Do you feel that the teacher was like what you expected her to be?

12. What things would you like to see the teacher do?

13. Do you feel that Head Start asks for too much of your time? Why?

14. In what ways do you feel different about Head Start now?

15. What changes have you noticed in your child and/or his behavior since he has been in Head Start?

16. If you or someone in your family is ill, where would you go?

17. If you had a legal problem, where would you go?

18. If you had a financial problem, where would you go for help or where have you gone?

19. If you had a personal, marital, or family problem, who would you go to for help, or where have you gone for help?

20. Do you belong to any local community groups or neighborhood associations of any type?

Parental Interview (con't)

21. Did you vote in the last Presidential election?

22. Did you vote in the last state and congressional election in 1966?

23. What kinds of things do you and your children do together?

24. If you could do anything you wanted for one day with no restrictions, what would you really like to do?

25. If you had $200 to spend on anything you wanted, what would you spend it on?

26. If you had nothing that interferred with your doing what you'd really like to do, what would you like to do during the coming year?

27. If you had $2,000 to spend on anything you wanted, what would you spend it on?

28. What kind of work would you like your child to do when he grows up?

29. How much schooling would you like your child to have?

30. If you were in charge of planning a program for young children, what kinds of things would you like to see included?

31. What area or part of this kind of program do you feel would be the most important?

32. What part of the program do you feel the children might like best?

33. What kinds of activities and programs, if any, do you think should be available to parents?

34. Have you, yourself, taken part in any of the Head Start activities for parents?

35. What do you think about these programs - how do you think they could be made better - more enjoyable - more worthwhile?

36. What do you like about these programs?

37. Was there anything you disliked?

38. In general, if you could make three changes in Head Start, what would they be?

39. If you had a friend or a neighbor with a child of Head Start age, do you think you would encourage her to take part in the program?

40. What sort of life would you like your child to have when he grows up?

1. When did you first have a child in Head Start? _____

2. Has your child ever been in any other preschool program? _____

Your Family or Other Persons Living in the Home

| | Sex | Age | Amount of Education or present grade in school | Marital Status | Relationship to you | Place of Birth | What Language does he or she speak? | How Many Weeks Worked During Past Year? At What Salary? | Other income (BPA, Social Security, alimony, child support, unemployment.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yourself | | | | | | | | | |
| Others (Children & Adults) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

4. Religious preference? _____

5. How long in Los Angeles? _____

6. How long in present neighborhood? _____

7. If born in another country, how long in U.S.? _____

8. Race or Ethnic Group _____